



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,241	08/18/2003	Cheng-Hwa Liu	252011-1180	3277
47390	7590	05/31/2006	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HOSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY SUITE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339			CAO, PHUONG THAO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,241	LIU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 03/28/2006.
2. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended and claims 10 and 20 have been cancelled.

Currently, claims 1-9 and 11-19 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-9 and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pape et al. (US Patent No 6,664,897) and further in view of Macbeath et al. (Publication No US 2004/0111346).

As to claim 1, Pape et al. teach:

“A symmetry database system for a data processing system” (see [column 18, lines 15-35]), comprising:

“a data source for storing source data” (see [column 29, lines 15-35] and [column 18, lines 20-30] wherein “PERD transaction databases” or “source database” is equivalent to Applicant’s “data source for storing source data”);

“a data preparation platform to filter the source data into a symmetry data source” (see e.g., [column 18, lines 20-35] wherein data from transaction databases is equivalent to Applicant’s “source data”, “data marts” is equivalent to Applicant’s “symmetry data source” and the disclosure of extracting data to create data marts as disclosed implies the inclusion of a data preparation platform to filter the source data as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“a plurality of process engines to fetch data from the symmetry data source and generate results according to the data” (see [column 18, lines 20-35] and [column 30, lines 5-25] wherein each of processing supply chain entities or data distribution centers implies a process engine as illustrated in Application’s claim language).

Pape et al. do not teach “wherein the process engines are serial data process engines, and one of the process engines fetches both data from the symmetry data source and results from another of the process engines”.

Macbeath et al. teach “wherein the process engines are serial data process engines, and one of the process engines fetches both data from the symmetry data source and results from another of the process engines” (see [0136] wherein each analytical system or each computer system of other firms or agencies is equivalent to each of Applicant’s “process engines”, these

computer systems process as a serial data process engines as illustrated in Applicant's claim language since one of the analytical system may combine the data in the database with data provided by one of computer system of other firms or agencies wherein data output from a computer system can be considered as its results; also see [0003]-[0005]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pape et al. by the teaching of Macbeath et al., since modifying the process engines as a serial process engines wherein one of the process engines fetches both data from the symmetry data source and results from another of the process engines provides the ability of the process engines to interoperate. As a result, it provides the ability to interoperate services among organizations in order to communicate and process data more effectively and efficiently.

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“wherein the data source comprises a plurality of databases, the symmetry data source comprises a plurality of symmetry databases, and the data preparation platform filter data from the plurality of databases into corresponding symmetry databases” (see [column 18, lines 20-35] and [column 29, lines 5-55] wherein “PERD transaction databases” is equivalent to Applicant's “data source”, “data marts” is equivalent to Applicant's “symmetry data source” and the creation of data marts as disclosed implies the inclusion of a data preparation platform as illustrated in Applicant's claim language, also see [column 42, lines 14-25]).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“logic for aligning data in the data source to link the databases in the data source” (see e.g., [column 26, lines 53] discloses the import of data in form of one animal per row with animal attributes in each column of the row, from any databases and tables; this implies the aligning data as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“logic for nature-checking the aligned data” (see e.g., [column 21, lines 55-67] disclose that data is enforced to be created with acceptable values, limits, ranges and/or formats; this implies the inclusion of a checking method which is equivalent to Applicant’s “nature-checking”); and

“logic for checking the aligned data by applying business rules of the process engines to filter the data that does not pass the business rules, so as to generate the symmetry data source” (see [column 22, lines 10-20], [column 25, lines 40-60], [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein components database or data marts represent Applicant’s “symmetry data source”).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“logic for filtering the aligned data using a flexible filter to generate the symmetry data source” (see [column 26, line 1-25] wherein the user interfaces to provide means of extracting

specific data for data marts (equivalent to Applicant's "symmetry data source") is equivalent to Applicant's "flexible filter").

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

"logic for listing primary keys of source tables in the data source" (see [column 44, lines 1-60] wherein Animal ID, carcass ID, Batch ID, Primal ID are primary key of source tables);

"logic for finding popular items according to a frequency of the primary keys in the source tables and the business rules of the processing engines" (see [column 44, lines 30] wherein Animal ID, Carcass ID, Batch ID and Primal ID are popular items according to business rules [column 45, lines 10-13] as illustrated in Applicant's claim language); and

"logic for finding at least one critical item from the popular item, whereby the databases in the data source can be linked using at least one critical item" (see e.g., [column 44, lines 1-40] discloses that the data warehouse is typically maintained to identify each entity which implied the inclusion of a logic of finding at least one critical item to link databases in data warehouse (equivalent to Applicant's "data source") as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“a plurality of data generators corresponding to each process engine to fetch data needed by each process engine from the symmetry data source” (see [column 28, lines 25-35] wherein “data marts” is equivalent to Applicant’s “symmetry data source”, each of “processing supply chain entities is equivalent to Applicant’s “process engine”, and the extraction of data from data marts by the processing supply chain entities implies the inclusion of a plurality of data generators as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“an application interface to provide users with access to the data source in real time” (see [column 17, lines 35-50], [column 27, lines 30-55] and [column 28, lines 5-15]).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“a monitor unit to monitor access of the data source through the application interface, and notify administrators or other responsible parties if a process engine crashes or result errors occur” (see [column 22, lines 5-25] wherein notification and messaging with error logging implies the inclusion of a monitor unit as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 24, lines 4-10] and [column 28, lines 5-40]).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Pape et al. as modified teach:

“wherein the monitor unit further identifies and repairs problems corresponding to process engine crashes or result errors according to the data source and the symmetry data source” (see [column 30, lines 5-12] wherein “Pony Express server” is equivalent to Applicant’s “data source”, “CISData mart” is equivalent to Applicant’s “symmetry data source”, and “locating and correcting errors in existing data” is equivalent to Applicant’s “identifies and repairs problems...”).

As to claims 11-19, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1-9 and are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

May 23, 2006

Luke S. Hession
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167